

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 THEODORE STEVENS,

Case No. 3:25-cv-00281-MMD-CSD

7 Petitioner,

ORDER

8 v.

9 JOE LOMBARDO, *et al.*,10 Respondents.
11

12 The Court dismissed Petitioner Theodore Stevens' *pro se* petition for writ of
13 habeas corpus as second and successive, judgment was entered, and the case was
14 closed. (ECF Nos. 16, 18.) Now before the Court are the fifth and sixth post-judgment
15 motions filed by Stevens—what he has styled as a motion to vacate order and motion for
16 order to cease and desist. (ECF Nos. 29, 30.) He appears to argue that the Court did not
17 rule on a certain claim in his earlier petition. The Court has now repeatedly advised
18 Stevens that if he wishes to file a successive petition, he must obtain authorization from
19 the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals before he can proceed in this Court. See 28 U.S.C. §
20 2244(3)(A); *see also McNabb v. Yates*, 576 F.3d 1028, 1029-1030 (9th Cir. 2009);
21 *Henderson v. Lampert*, 396 F.3d 1049, 1053 (9th Cir. 2005). Regardless of whether
22 Stevens' argument is correct, he must get authorization to file another petition. The Court
23 finds the motions frivolous and denies them. The Court advises Stevens not to file any
24 further motions in this closed case.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 It is therefore ordered that Stevens' motion to vacate order and motion for order to
2 cease and desist (ECF Nos. 29 and 30) are denied.

3 DATED THIS 31st Day of October 2025.

4
5 

6

MIRANDA M. DU
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28